

Montrose Chemical Corp. of California v. Superior Court (Canadian Universal)

Year: 2026

Court: California Supreme Court

Case Number: S285083, S293914

United Policyholders submitted multiple letters in support of the petition for review as well as an amicus brief on the merits. UP's submissions argue that when interpreting insurance policies, courts should not refuse to consider relevant extrinsic evidence simply because the policy language appears unambiguous on its face. California law requires courts to examine evidence such as drafting history and industry usage before deciding whether a policy provision is reasonably susceptible to a policyholder's interpretation.

David Goodwin of Covington and Burling

The information presented in this publication is for general informational purposes and is not a substitute for legal advice. If you have a specific legal issue or problem, United Policyholders recommends that you consult with an attorney. Guidance on hiring professional help can be found in the "Find Help" section of www.uphelp.org. United Policyholders does not sell insurance or certify, endorse or warrant any of the insurance products, vendors, or professionals identified on our website.

Source: <https://uphelp.org/amicus-briefs/montrose-chemical-corp-of-california-v-superior-court-canadian-universal/> Date: June

27, 2026